



INSPECTOR GENERAL

U.S. Department of Defense

SEPTEMBER 16, 2015



U.S. Army Corps of Engineers— Alaska District Needs to Improve Competitive Procedures for Cooperative Agreements for Alaska Integrated Natural Resources Management Plans



INTEGRITY ★ EFFICIENCY ★ ACCOUNTABILITY ★ EXCELLENCE

INTEGRITY ★ EFFICIENCY ★ ACCOUNTABILITY ★ EXCELLENCE

Mission

Our mission is to provide independent, relevant, and timely oversight of the Department of Defense that supports the warfighter; promotes accountability, integrity, and efficiency; advises the Secretary of Defense and Congress; and informs the public.

Vision

Our vision is to be a model oversight organization in the Federal Government by leading change, speaking truth, and promoting excellence—a diverse organization, working together as one professional team, recognized as leaders in our field.



For more information about whistleblower protection, please see the inside back cover.



Results in Brief

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers–Alaska District Needs to Improve Competitive Procedures for Cooperative Agreements for Alaska Integrated Natural Resources Management Plans

September 16, 2015

Objective

Our objective was to determine whether DoD properly awarded contracts and cooperative agreements on a sole-source basis for the development and implementation of integrated natural resources management plans (INRMPs) on DoD installations in Alaska.

Findings

Grants officers from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE)–Alaska District did not properly award or effectively use cooperative agreements issued on a sole-source basis, valued at about \$18 million, for the development and implementation of INRMPs at Joint Base Elmendorf–Richardson (JBER) and Fort Wainwright, Alaska. This occurred because grants officers:

- did not follow the DoD Grants and Agreements Regulations to maximize competition;
- issued the cooperative agreements or task orders as directed by JBER and Fort Wainwright personnel rather than perform sufficient market research to determine recipients; and
- did not have clear guidance from the Deputy Under Secretary of Defense, (Installations and Environment), on DoD's implementation of the Sikes Act requirements.

As a result, USACE did not obtain the benefits of competition and may have paid more than necessary. Additionally, they awarded cooperative agreements that did not meet DoD's interpretation of the Sikes Act requirement to give priority to Alaskan State agencies before they obtain support by other means.

Findings (cont'd)

In addition, personnel from the Fort Wainwright Mission Installation Contracting Command properly awarded three contracts for INRMP support, with a value (including options) of \$32.8 million, by justifying the use of other than full and open competition. Fort Wainwright contracting personnel generally complied with Federal Acquisition Regulation requirements related to noncompetitive contracting.

Recommendations

We recommend that the Deputy Under Secretary of Defense (Installations and Environment) develop guidance to require competition for task orders when multiple cooperative agreements exist and to issue guidance clarifying that priority should be given to the respective State fish and wildlife agencies.

We recommend the Garrison Commander, JBER and the Chief, Directorate of Public Works, Fort Wainwright, discontinue directing which universities or soil and water districts obtain cooperative agreements or associated task orders.

We recommend that the Contracting Division Chief, USACE Alaska District develop procedures and implement controls related to the award and management of cooperative agreements to improve competition. In addition, we recommend that the Contracting Division Chief require training for grants officers on proper award and management of cooperative agreements.

Management Comments and Our Response

We did not receive comments to the draft report. We request that the Deputy Under Secretary of Defense (Installations and Environment); Commander, JBER; Chief, Directorate of Public Works, Fort Wainwright; and the Contracting Chief, USACE, Alaska District, provide comments to the final report. Please see the Recommendations Table on the back of this page.

Recommendations Table

Management	Recommendations Requiring Comment	No Additional Comments Required
Deputy Under Secretary of Defense (Installations and Environment)	A.2.a. and A.2.b.	
Commander, Joint Base Elmendorf–Richardson	A.3.	
Chief, Directorate of Public Works, Fort Wainwright	A.4.	
Contracting Chief, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Alaska District	A.1.a., A.1.b., A.1.c., A.1.d., and A.1.e.	

Please provide Management Comments by October 16, 2015.



**INSPECTOR GENERAL
DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE
4800 MARK CENTER DRIVE
ALEXANDRIA, VIRGINIA 22350-1500**

September 16, 2015

MEMORANDUM FOR UNDER SECRETARY OF DEFENSE FOR ACQUISITION,
TECHNOLOGY, AND LOGISTICS
ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE AIR FORCE
(FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT AND COMPTROLLER)
COMMANDING GENERAL, U.S. ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS
AUDITOR GENERAL, DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

SUBJECT: U.S. Army Corps of Engineers-Alaska District Needs to Improve Competitive
Procedures for Cooperative Agreements for Alaska Integrated Natural Resources
Management Plans (Report No. DODIG-2015-174)

We are providing this report for review and comment. Grants officers from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers-Alaska District did not properly award or effectively use cooperative agreements issued on a sole-source basis for the development and implementation of integrated natural resources management plans on DoD installations in Alaska. We conducted this audit in accordance with generally accepted government auditing standards.

DoD Instruction 7650.03 requires that recommendations be resolved promptly. The Deputy Under Secretary of Defense (Installations and Environment); Commander, Joint Base Elmendorf-Richardson; Chief, Directorate of Public Works, Fort Wainwright; and the Contracting Chief, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Alaska District, did not provide comments to the draft report. Please provide comments that state whether you agree or disagree with the findings and recommendations. If you agree with our recommendations, describe what actions you have taken or plan to take to accomplish the recommendations and include the actual or planned completion dates of your actions. If you disagree with the recommendations or any part of them, please give specific reasons why you disagree and propose alternative action if that is appropriate. You should also comment on the internal control weaknesses discussed in the report. Therefore, we request comments on the recommendations and internal control weaknesses by October 16, 2015.

Please send a PDF file containing your comments to audcmp@dodig.mil. Copies of your comments must have the actual signature of the authorizing official for your organization. We cannot accept the /Signed/ symbol in place of the actual signature. If you arrange to send classified comments electronically, you must send them over the SECRET Internet Protocol Router Network (SIPRNET).

We appreciate the courtesies extended to the staff. Please direct questions to me at (703) 604-9187 (DSN 664-9187).

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "M. Roark", is positioned above the name of the Assistant Inspector General.

Michael J. Roark
Assistant Inspector General
Contract Management and Payments

Contents

Introduction

Objective	1
Background	1
Review of Internal Controls	5

Finding A. USACE–Alaska District Grants Officers Did Not Properly Award or Effectively Use Cooperative Agreements

USACE–Alaska District Grants Officers Did Not Maximize Competition When They Awarded Cooperative Agreements	6
Conclusion	15
Recommendations	15
Management Comments Required	17

Finding B. Fort Wainwright Mission Installation Contracting Command Personnel Properly Awarded Contracts for INRMP Support

Fort Wainwright Contracting Personnel Followed FAR Guidance for Sole-Source Awards	18
Summary	23

Appendixes

Appendix A. Scope and Methodology	24
Review of Documentation and Interviews	24
Use of Computer-Processed Data	26
Prior Coverage	26
Appendix B. Projects Awarded for the Development and Implementation of the INRMP at Joint Base Elmendorf–Richardson, Alaska	27
Appendix C. Projects Awarded for the Development and Implementation of INRMP at Fort Wainwright, Alaska	29

Acronyms and Abbreviations

Introduction

Objective

Our objective was to determine whether DoD properly awarded contracts and cooperative agreements on a sole-source basis for the development and implementation of integrated natural resources management plans (INRMPs) on DoD installations in Alaska. See Appendix A for scope and methodology.

Background

We received Defense hotline allegations and congressional interest related to relationships between Colorado State University (CSU) personnel and DoD personnel responsible for the development and implementation of INRMPs on Alaska installations. The allegations expressed concern about the issuance of a sole-source cooperative agreement between the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE)–Alaska District and CSU.

Rather than focus on the allegations, we performed an audit on the award processes for sole-source contracts and cooperative agreements for INRMP support at three bases in Alaska:

- Joint Base Elmendorf–Richardson (JBER);
- Fort Wainwright; and
- Eielson Air Force Base (AFB).

The Sikes Act

Congress established the Sikes Act¹ in 1960 to ensure DoD conserves and protects the natural resources it uses. The Act promotes conservation activities while it allows military lands to continue to meet the needs of military operations. Congress amended the Sikes Act in 1997 to require DoD to develop and implement INRMPs that outline how each military installation with significant natural resources will manage those resources. INRMPs integrate military mission requirements, environmental and master planning documents, cultural resources, and outdoor recreation to ensure both military operations and natural resources conservation are included and consistent with stewardship and legal requirements.

The Secretary of each military department ensures INRMPs are completed for their installations and are prepared in cooperation with fish and wildlife agencies at the Federal and State level. Installation personnel review and update INRMPs annually. In addition to the annual review, the Sikes Act requires DoD officials to

¹ Sections 670-670f, title 16, United States Code.

review, in coordination with agencies that co-manage natural resources, INRMPs for operation and effectiveness at least every 5 years. The Deputy Under Secretary of Defense (Installations and Environment) issues policy to implement the Act and oversees INRMPs at DoD installations.

Cooperative Agreements

The DoD Grants and Agreements Regulations (DoDGARs),² states a cooperative agreement is a legal instrument used to enter a relationship where:

- the principal purpose of the relationship is to transfer resources of value to the recipient to carry out a public purpose of support authorized by a law of the U.S. instead of acquiring property or services for the direct benefit or use of the U.S. Government; and
- substantial involvement is expected between DoD and the recipient when carrying out the activity contemplated in the agreement.

For all new grants and cooperative agreements, effective December 26, 2014, DoD components are required to follow the Office of Management and Budget guidance.³

Awards for INRMP Development and Implementation

Personnel from the 673rd Civil Engineer Squadron at JBER; Fort Wainwright Directorate of Public Works; and from other bases, used cooperative agreements awarded by USACE–Alaska District for the development and implementation of their INRMPs. Personnel from JBER and Fort Wainwright requested the USACE–Alaska District to award cooperative agreements or task orders from those cooperative agreements in support of their INRMPs. Grants officers from the USACE–Alaska District awarded sole-source cooperative agreements to:

- CSU, effective July 13, 2010;
- Alaska Pacific University, effective June 14, 2012;
- University of Alaska–Anchorage, effective April 17, 2014;
- Palmer Soil and Water Conservation District, effective July 9, 2014; and
- Salcha Delta Soil and Water Conservation District, effective July 9, 2014.

Grants officers from USACE–Alaska District awarded the five cooperative agreements to establish formal relationships for the necessary support to develop and implement the INRMPs and subsequently awarded task orders from those agreements for specific tasks needed. The grants officers awarded nearly identical

² DoDGARs, Title 32, “Code of Federal Regulations (CFR),” Subchapter C.

³ Title 2 CFR, Part 200 “Uniform Administrative Requirements, Cost Principles, and Audit Requirements for Federal Awards,” 2014.

cooperative agreements with the universities for research activities. They awarded cooperative agreements with the conservation districts for activities such as erosion control, revegetation, and soil rehabilitation. See Figure 1 and 2 for examples of activities completed by the universities that show beluga whale monitoring and alpine wetlands surveys performed in support of the INRMPs.



Figure 1. Beluga Whale Monitoring
Source: JBER



Figure 2. Alpine Wetlands Surveys
Source: JBER

INRMP Implementation Completed Internally or Through Other Means

In addition to the five cooperative agreements, Fort Wainwright and Eielson AFB used other resources to complete work related to their INRMPs or completed the work internally. Personnel from the Fort Wainwright Mission Installation Contracting Command issued three contracts⁴ for INRMP support, as shown in the Table below.

Table. Contracts Awarded by Personnel From the Fort Wainwright Mission Installation Contracting Command

Contract	Award Date	Value (with options)	Awarded to
W912CZ-09-D-0016	July 10, 2009	\$25 million	Salcha-Delta Soil and Water Conservation District
W912CZ-09-D-0017	July 17, 2009	\$7.5 million	Palmer Soil and Water Conservation District
W912D0-11-D-0003	September 26, 2011	\$300,000	Alaska Department of Fish and Game

⁴ Two contracts were awarded by the U.S. Army Contracting Agency Element, Pacific–Fort Wainwright, Alaska in July 2009. The U.S. Army Contracting Agency Element, Pacific–Fort Wainwright was consolidated into the Fort Wainwright Mission Installation Contracting Command in 2010.

In addition to the cooperative agreements and contracts, Fort Wainwright personnel entered into a Memorandum of Agreement with the Alaska Department of Fish and Game and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Services (Region 7) on June 10, 2013, for INRMP support. Eielson AFB personnel stated they did not use the cooperative agreements or contracts; instead, they performed the work internally.

Projects Performed With Cooperative Agreements

USACE-Alaska District grants officers awarded the cooperative agreements for various types of projects for the development and implementation of the INRMPs. For example, the grants officers at USACE-Alaska District awarded task orders through the cooperative agreements for several projects that protect the Cook Inlet beluga whale at JBER. The National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) listed the whale as an endangered species in 2008. In 2011, NOAA designated the Cook Inlet as a critical habitat to protect beluga whales in Alaska. A critical habitat is considered a habitat essential to the species' conservation.

According to the JBER INRMP, noise that the military generates becomes a natural resources concern when it has the potential to affect an endangered species. Figure 3 and 4 show projects that monitor and observe beluga whales in support of the INRMP.



Figure 3. Monitor Device Installed on a Beluga Whales
Source: NOAA

Figure 4. Beluga Whale Observation
Source: JBER

Review of Internal Controls

DoD Instruction 5010.40, “Managers’ Internal Control Program Procedures,” May 30, 2013, requires DoD organizations to implement a comprehensive system of internal controls that provides reasonable assurance that programs are operating as intended and to evaluate the effectiveness of the controls. We identified internal control weaknesses associated with the award and use of cooperative agreements issued on a sole-source basis for the development and implementation of INRMPs on DoD installations in Alaska. We will provide a copy of the final report to the senior official responsible for internal controls for USACE.

Finding A

USACE–Alaska District Grants Officers Did Not Properly Award or Effectively Use Cooperative Agreements

USACE–Alaska District grants officers did not properly award or effectively use cooperative agreements issued on a sole-source basis, valued at \$18 million,⁵ for the development and implementation of INRMPs at JBER and Fort Wainwright in Alaska. This occurred because grants officers from the USACE–Alaska District:

- did not follow DoDGARs guidance to maximize competition;
- issued the cooperative agreements or task orders as directed by JBER 673rd Civil Engineer Squadron personnel and Fort Wainwright Directorate of Public Works personnel rather than perform sufficient market research to determine appropriate cooperative agreement recipients; and
- did not have clear guidance from the Deputy Under Secretary of Defense, (Installations and Environment), on DoD’s implementation of the Sikes Act requirements.

As a result, USACE–Alaska District did not obtain the benefits of competition, and may have paid more than necessary. Additionally, they awarded cooperative agreements that did not meet DoD’s interpretation of the Sikes Act requirement to give priority to Alaskan State agencies before they obtained the support by other means.

⁵ We used rounded numbers throughout the report. The value includes the value of the task orders related to the performance of work related to INRMP support at JBER and Fort Wainwright, as reported by the USACE grants officer, from July 13, 2010, through March 23, 2015.

USACE–Alaska District Grants Officers Did Not Maximize Competition When They Awarded Cooperative Agreements

Grants officers at the USACE–Alaska District awarded and used five cooperative agreements for INRMP services without properly justifying the lack of competition. From July 2010 through July 2014, the grants officers awarded the five cooperative agreements on a sole-source basis for development and implementation of INRMPs at JBER and Fort Wainwright in Alaska. JBER and Fort Wainwright used the cooperative agreements to complete specific tasks to develop or implement their INRMP.

USACE–Alaska District Grants Officers Did Not Maximize Competition When They Awarded Cooperative Agreements

Grants officers at the USACE–Alaska District did not follow DoDGARs when they awarded five cooperative agreements on a sole-source basis to develop and implement INRMPs at JBER or Fort Wainwright. Subpart C of the DoDGARs states that DoD policy is to maximize competition in awarding cooperative agreements using merit-based, competitive procedures to the maximum extent practicable. Competitive procedures include, at a minimum;

- a notice to prospective proposers:
 - a notice of funding availability;
 - a publically disseminated announcement with unlimited distribution; or
 - a specific notice to at least two eligible, prospective proposers;
- a synopsis for each notice posted to the Office of Management and Budget designated website;⁶
- at least two eligible, prospective proposers; and
- an impartial review of the merits of proposals received in response to the notice.

Grants officers from the USACE–Alaska District awarded the five cooperative agreements on a sole-source basis without conducting market research, posting the appropriate notice for proposals, supporting the lack of competition, or maintaining grants files supporting the basis for the awards. In addition, the grants officers did not consider the other four cooperative agreements when they awarded the majority of the task orders to CSU. The USACE–Alaska District Contracting Division Chief should require training for grants officers on how to properly award and manage cooperative agreements.

USACE–Alaska District Grants Officers Did Not Conduct Market Research Before They Awarded Sole-Source Cooperative Agreements

Grants officers from the USACE–Alaska District did not conduct market research to identify potential recipients for the cooperative agreements before awarding them sole source. DoDGARs does not require grants officers to perform market research,⁷ but it does require them to use competitive procedures to the maximum extent practicable.

⁶ Currently www.grants.gov.

⁷ “Market research” is generally defined as collecting and analyzing information about capabilities within the market to satisfy agency needs. (Federal Acquisition Regulation, subpart 2.1)

To maximize the use of competition and determine what competitive procedures are practicable in the case of a particular award, grants officers should perform some market research.⁸ When asked if market research was conducted to identify potential competitors, a grants officer from the USACE–Alaska District stated that he posted a notice to the Federal Business Opportunities site. The notice was a “special notice” with a response date of July 20, 2010; however, the grants officer awarded the cooperative agreement with CSU on July 13, 2010.

The notice stated USACE–Alaska District intends to renew a cooperative agreement with CSU and was not a notice for competitive proposals. If the grants officer would have performed market research on the requirements, then there may have been multiple Federal and State entities in Alaska capable of providing the required support. This includes the Alaskan universities, which the grants officers awarded cooperative agreements for INRMP support. The USACE–Alaska District Contracting Division Chief should require personnel to conduct adequate market research to increase competition to the maximum extent practicable when they award cooperative agreements for INRMP development and implementation.

USACE–Alaska District Grants Officer Did Not Post an Appropriate Notice for Competitive Proposals

A grants officer from the USACE–Alaska District did not appropriately advertise the upcoming cooperative agreements to obtain competitive proposals. The grants officer posted a notice of intent to award a sole-source cooperative agreement to CSU on the Federal Business Opportunities website at www.fbo.gov instead of posting a notice of funding opportunity. The DoDGARs requires posting to www.grants.gov. The Federal Business Opportunities site provides notices related to contracts for for-profit vendors; www.grants.gov provides notices of funding opportunities related to grants or cooperative agreements. By posting on the Federal Business Opportunities website, USACE–Alaska District personnel did not provide adequate notice of the opportunity to compete to the proper potential recipients. In addition, the grants officer did not post the “notice of opportunities” to either the www.fbo.gov or the www.grants.gov websites for the other four sole source cooperative agreements awarded for the development and implementation of INRMPs.

Grants officers from the USACE–Alaska District only recently obtained access to www.grants.gov to post notices as required by DoDGARs. On May 7, 2015, a grants officer posted a notice to www.grants.gov for the award of a cooperative agreement

⁸ We found a “Cooperative Agreements U.S. Army Corps Standard Operating Procedure” prepared by the USACE–Portland District. Among its terms, the Standard Operating Procedure assigns to the Grants Officer the responsibility to “Conduct market research to identify potential eligible applicants and disseminate information regarding the upcoming requirement in order to increase competition.” We consider this a best practice.

for environmental services. The grants officer identified the May 7, 2015, posting as unrestricted, or opened to all parties, but the description of the opportunity identified CSU as the intended recipient.

The cooperative agreement would replace the current agreement with CSU that expired in July 2015. By writing the description in this manner, the grants officer treated this as a sole-source opportunity again. On June 18, 2015, the grants officer updated the posting and deleted CSU from the description. The USACE–Alaska District Contracting Division Chief should require personnel to appropriately advertise future opportunities to increase competition to the maximum extent practicable when they award cooperative agreements for INRMP development and implementation.

USACE–Alaska District Grants Officers Awarded Sole-Source Cooperative Agreements Without Supporting the Lack of Competition

Grants officers from USACE–Alaska District did not adequately justify why they awarded the five cooperative agreements as sole source.

Grants officers from USACE–Alaska District did not adequately justify why they awarded the five cooperative agreements as sole source. A grants officer from the USACE–Alaska District created a written justification for the CSU cooperative agreement; however, the justification was not adequate and incorrectly cited the Sikes Act as the authority for the sole-source agreement.⁹ The grants officer did not create a written justification for the other four cooperative agreements. In the CSU justification, the grants officer inappropriately included information from Army Regulation (AR) 200—3,¹⁰ to justify why CSU was issued a sole-source cooperative agreement. Additionally, this section of AR 200—3 provided guidance for issuing contracts for natural resources management, not cooperative agreements. The document that replaced AR 200—3 did not contain the information stated in the CSU cooperative agreement justification.

Personnel from the USACE–Alaska District could not adequately justify why they awarded each of the five agreements as sole source or why competition was not pursued. USACE–Alaska District personnel did not support why they considered each of the five cooperative agreements to be sole source when there were multiple capable sources. By awarding cooperative agreements for similar work, grants officers from the USACE–Alaska District demonstrated that a competitive market

⁹ The Sikes Act requires priority be given to certain Federal and State agencies when contracting for INRMP support, but does not permit a sole-source award when competition is possible.

¹⁰ AR 200—3, “Natural Resources — Land, Forest, and Wildlife Management,” February 28, 1995. NOTE: AR 200—3 became obsolete with the issuance of AR 200—1, “Environment Protection and Enhancement,” in August 2007. AR 200—3 stated that competitive bids were not required for contracts with Federal, State, and local agencies with responsibility for natural resources conservation.

does exist among multiple capable sources. Additionally, the grants officers could have limited competition to Federal and State agencies having responsibility for conservation or management of fish and wildlife, as authorized by the Sikes Act, and still complied with DoDGARs by competing the cooperative agreements among those Federal and State entities. The USACE–Alaska District Contracting Division Chief should require personnel to develop and retain adequate documentation to support market research and award decisions for cooperative agreements.

Army officials in the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Installations, Energy, and Environment are revising AR 200—1. We reviewed a section of the draft of this revision that incorporates language from the Sikes Act that gives priority to Federal and State agencies. The draft did not include language that would restrict competition among the eligible entities within this priority. This revision will address the concerns we identified during our audit relating to Army specific policies on INRMPs; therefore, we will not make a recommendation in this area.

USACE–Alaska District Grants Officers Did Not Appropriately Maintain Files for the Cooperative Agreements

Grants officers from the USACE–Alaska District did not appropriately maintain cooperative agreement files for the five agreements that supported actions taken and decisions made on the award and management of these agreements. According to DoDGARs,¹¹ a grants officer should document the nature of the substantial involvement that led to selection of a cooperative agreement. As a best practice, a grants officer should also include documentation to support the basis for the cooperative agreement and award, similar to the Federal Acquisition Regulation’s (FAR’s) requirements¹² for contract files.

A grants file typically includes the application, required certifications, documents that support approval for deviations from applicable policy, and the award document. The grants officers included the award documents in the cooperative agreement file; however, they did not have:

- documents to support why a cooperative agreement was used;
- approvals for deviations from policies such as maximizing competition; and
- the application or required certifications in the grants file.

By training grants officers on the proper award and management of grants files, USACE–Alaska District should improve compliance with DoDGARs requirements.

¹¹ DoDGARs 22.215(a)(2).

¹² FAR Subpart 4.8 “Government Contract Files.”

USACE–Alaska District Grants Officers Did Not Effectively Use Cooperative Agreements When They Awarded Task Orders

Grants officers from the USACE–Alaska District awarded most of the task orders for INRMP services to CSU based on direction from personnel at 673rd Civil Engineering Squadron personnel at JBER and Fort Wainwright Directorate of Public Works without considering other cooperative agreements in place for INRMP development and implementation. By issuing the majority of task orders to CSU without considering the other cooperative agreements, USACE–Alaska District personnel may have paid more than necessary.

Personnel from the 673rd Civil Engineer Squadron and Fort Wainwright Directorate of Public Works directed grants officers from USACE–Alaska District to award task orders to CSU; however, grants officers did not consider awarding other universities with cooperative agreements or determine if the other universities were capable of providing comparable support at a lower price. The cooperative agreements with the three universities were all for research activities related to the INRMPs. The cooperative agreements with the two conservation districts were for activities such as erosion control and vegetation and soil rehabilitation related to the INRMPs.

The grants officers awarded task orders for the development and implementation of the INRMPs for JBER with a total value of \$5.1 million¹³ from July 13, 2010, through March 23, 2015. A grants officer awarded the CSU cooperative agreement, effective July 13, 2010. The grants officer awarded a second cooperative agreement for the development and implementation of INRMPs with Alaska Pacific University, effective June 14, 2012.

With at least two cooperative agreements in place for the same work starting June 14, 2012, the grants officer could have awarded task orders on a competitive basis among the universities. From June 14, 2012, through March 23, 2015, the grants officers awarded task orders related to development and implementation of the INRMPs for JBER with a total value of \$3.7 million. Of that total, they awarded \$3.3 million to CSU, and awarded the remaining \$379,976 to Alaska Pacific University. See Appendix B for a list of task orders awarded for INRMP development and implementation at JBER from July 13, 2010 through March 23, 2015.

In addition, for Fort Wainwright, grants officers awarded task orders from July 13, 2010, through March 23, 2015, with a total value of \$13 million. Of the \$13 million, they awarded \$2.3 million to Salcha Delta Soil and Water Conservation District, and awarded the remainder to CSU. They did not award task orders to the

¹³ The values in this section were calculated from the task order values as reported by the USACE grants officer.

other universities for work at Fort Wainwright. See Appendix C for a list of task orders awarded for INRMP development and implementation at Fort Wainwright from July 13, 2010, through March 23, 2015.

Although DoDGARs does not contain specific guidance that requires competition of task orders when multiple cooperative agreements are in place, the grants officers have the responsibility under DoDGARs 21.465 to ensure awards are used effectively in the execution of DoD programs. Therefore, as a best practice, USACE-Alaska District grants officers should compete task orders among cooperative agreements that are in place. The Deputy Under Secretary of Defense (Installations and Environment), should develop and issue guidance that supports competitive procedures among task orders when multiple cooperative agreements related to the development and implementation of INRMPs are in place.

Program Officials Directed the Use of Specific Cooperative Agreements

Grants officers from the USACE-Alaska District awarded cooperative agreements for INRMP support to sources specified by Fort Wainwright program personnel instead of competing the requirements to the maximum extent possible, as required in DoDGARs. In addition, they awarded task orders directly to specific cooperative agreements based on what was identified in the Military Interdepartmental Purchase Requests (MIPR) instead of maximizing competition.

When awarding the five cooperative agreements, the grants officers did not compete the requirements to award a cooperative agreement when requested by Fort Wainwright personnel. For example, on May 8, 2014, personnel from the Fort Wainwright Directorate of Public Works requested USACE-Alaska District personnel to award cooperative agreements with the Soil and Water Conservation Districts. The USACE-Alaska District grants officer awarded cooperative agreements with the Soil and Water Conservation Districts on July 9, 2014, without additional documentation or rationale to support the decision.



They also directed which cooperative agreement to use within the MIPRs.

When awarding task orders on the cooperative agreements, the grants officers issued the task orders to the entity specified in the MIPRs. To obtain services to complete projects related to the implementation of the INRMP, personnel from the 673rd Civil Engineer Squadron at JBER and Fort Wainwright Directorate of Public Works sent MIPRs to USACE personnel. They also directed which cooperative agreement to use within the MIPRs.

Grants officers should only accept MIPRs that identify the requirements and do not inhibit competition. DoDGARs¹⁴ states that grants officers should be allowed wide latitude to exercise judgment in performing their responsibilities including ensuring that awards are used effectively in the execution of DoD programs and recipients receive impartial, fair, and equitable treatment. The Commander, JBER and the Chief, Directorate of Public Works, Fort Wainwright should direct personnel to discontinue directing which specific universities or soil and water districts obtain a cooperative agreement or associated task orders for the development and implementation of INRMPs.

Clear DoD Guidance to Implement the Sikes Act Does Not Exist

Grants officers from the USACE-Alaska District did not give priority to Federal and Alaskan State fish and wildlife agencies when they awarded cooperative agreements for INRMP support as intended by DoD's interpretation of the Sikes Act, missing opportunities to take advantage of their expertise. Section 670a of the Sikes Act states:

With regard to the implementation and enforcement of integrated natural resources management plans...priority shall be given to the entering into of contracts for the procurement of such implementation and enforcement services with Federal and State agencies having responsibility for the conservation or management of fish or wildlife.

We met with personnel from Federal, Alaskan agencies, and universities.¹⁵ They stated that they were never given the opportunity to perform work for DoD and would be willing to provide additional services if requested.

On January 28, 2014, the Deputy Under Secretary of Defense (Installations and Environment) issued a memorandum stating that contracting preference should be given to respective States for INRMP implementation. The office issued a second memorandum on June 20, 2014 that superseded this memorandum. The second memorandum clarifies that State agencies also have priority for cooperative agreements but does not specifically include that it is the respective State in which the DoD installation was located.

We reviewed the Sikes Act and the memorandums from January 2014 and June 2014. We could not determine whether the priority treatment identified in the Sikes Act applied to the respective State that the installation was located in or broadly to any State agency responsible for fish and wildlife management.

¹⁴ DoDGARs 21.465.

¹⁵ The agencies and universities included: U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Fairbanks and Anchorage; U.S. Bureau of Land Management, at Fort Wainwright and Anchorage; NOAA, Anchorage; Alaska Department of Fish and Game, Anchorage; Alaska Pacific University; and University of Alaska-Anchorage.

DoD General Counsel stated that DoD intended to limit this priority to the Federal and State agencies in which the installation is located, if those agencies are interested.¹⁶ DoD General Counsel stated that the respective State agencies should be given priority to take advantage of their expertise.

...the Office of the Deputy Under Secretary of Defense (Installations and Environment) did not adequately state the intended implementation of the Sikes Act...

However, the Office of the Deputy Under Secretary of Defense (Installations and Environment) did not adequately state the intended implementation of the Sikes Act in its memorandums.

The grants officer who awarded the cooperative agreement to CSU incorrectly cited that the Sikes Act authorized sole-source awards.

Additionally, the grants officer did not give priority as intended by DoD's interpretation of the Sikes Act, although the Office of the Under Secretary of Defense (Installations and Environment) did not communicate this intended interpretation until June 2014. We also determined that the Sikes Act language on priority consideration and the memorandums do not restrict grants officers from seeking non-priority sources if justified.

Fort Wainwright and USACE personnel also did not consistently use the Sikes Act priority or Army Regulations on a series of awards from July 2009 through September 2011. In July 2009, the U.S. Army Contracting Agency Element, Pacific-Fort Wainwright awarded two contracts on a sole-source basis with the justification that it was contracting with the State of Alaska's designated source to provide the support and that entity had the "right of first refusal" to provide the support based on the Sikes Act priority and AR 200—1.

In July 2010, the grants officer issued the cooperative agreement to CSU by also citing the Sikes Act. In September 2011, personnel from the Department of Public Works and Mission Installation Contract Command at Fort Wainwright, including some of the same personnel who were involved with May 2009 contracts, prepared documentation that cited the obsolete AR 200—3, instead of AR 200—1, to justify not soliciting competitive bids.

The Office of the Deputy Under Secretary of Defense (Installations and Environment), should issue guidance to clarify that priority should be given when awarding contracts and cooperative agreements for INRMP development and implementation to Federal agencies and the respective State fish and wildlife agencies. Subsequently, the USACE-Alaska District Contracting Division Chief

¹⁶ We recognize that there are installations situated in more than one state. The DoD General Counsel did not discuss this and it is not a condition affecting this audit.

should develop procedures that require personnel to give priority to Federal agencies and the respective State fish and wildlife agencies in accordance with DoD's clarified guidance when awarding cooperative agreements and contracts for INRMPs on Alaska installations.

Conclusion

Grants officers from USACE-Alaska District did properly award or effectively use cooperative agreements because they did not adequately use competitive procedures. The grants officers did not maximize competition as required by DoDGARs and, therefore, may have paid more than necessary. Additionally, they awarded a cooperative agreement directly to CSU that did not meet DoD's interpretation of the Sikes Act requirement to give priority to Alaskan State agencies before obtaining the support using other means.

By sole-sourcing five separate cooperative agreements and the task orders from those agreements, the grants officers did not provide potential opportunities and take advantage of the expertise of entities familiar with management of land, wildlife, and fish in Alaska. They could have awarded the agreements with limited competition to determine if better options were available. Although the Sikes Act does not require installations to use their respective State agencies, the grants officer did not consider other options available for support before awarding a sole-source cooperative agreement to CSU.

Since June 2012, personnel from USACE-Alaska District, JBER, and Fort Wainwright used the CSU cooperative agreement to obtain INRMP support. DoD General Counsel (Environment and Installations) indicated the intent was to use agencies within the installation's respective State. By incorporating our recommendations, DoD should meet the Sikes Act requirement to give priority to certain entities while still obtaining the benefits of competition for the needed INRMP support.

Recommendations

Recommendation A.1

We recommend that the Contracting Division Chief, United States Army Corps of Engineers Alaska District:

- a. require training for grants officers to properly award and manage cooperative agreements.**
- b. develop procedures for grants officers that require they conduct adequate market research to increase competition to the maximum**

- extent practicable when awarding cooperative agreements for Integrated Natural Resources Management Plan development and implementation.
- c. develop procedures for grants officers that require they appropriately advertise future opportunities to increase competition to the maximum extent practicable when awarding cooperative agreements for Integrated Natural Resources Management Plan development and implementation.
 - d. develop procedures to retain adequate documentation to support market research conducted and award decisions for cooperative agreements.
 - e. develop procedures that require personnel to give priority to Federal agencies and the respective State fish and wildlife agencies when awarding cooperative agreements and contracts for Integrated Natural Resources Management Plans on Alaska installations.

Recommendation A.2

We recommend that the Deputy Under Secretary of Defense (Installations and Environment):

- a. develop guidance that requires competition for task orders when multiple cooperative agreements exist related to the development and implementation of Integrated Natural Resources Management Plans.
- b. issue guidance to clarify that priority should be given when awarding contracts and cooperative agreements for Integrated Natural Resources Management Plan development and implementation to Federal agencies and the respective State fish and wildlife agencies.

Recommendation A.3

We recommend the Garrison Commander, Joint Base Elmendorf-Richardson direct personnel to discontinue directing which specific universities or soil and water districts obtain task orders for the development and implementation of Integrated Natural Resources Management Plans.

Recommendation A.4

We recommend the Chief, Directorate of Public Works, Fort Wainwright direct personnel to discontinue directing which specific universities or soil and water districts obtain cooperative agreements and associated task orders for the development and implementation of Integrated Natural Resources Management Plans.

Management Comments Required

The Contracting Division Chief, United States Army Corps of Engineers, Alaska District; Deputy Under Secretary of Defense (Installations and Environment); Garrison Commander, Joint Base Elmendorf-Richardson; and the Chief, Directorate of Public Works, Fort Wainwright, did not respond to the recommendations in the report. We request they provide comments on the final report.

Finding B

Fort Wainwright Mission Installation Contracting Command Personnel Properly Awarded Contracts for INRMP Support

Fort Wainwright Mission Installation Contracting Command¹⁷ personnel properly awarded three contracts for INRMP support, with a value (including options) of \$32.8 million, by justifying the use of other than full and open competition.

Fort Wainwright contracting personnel generally:

- complied with FAR Subpart 6.303-2, "Content," requirements in the justification and approvals (J&As) for other than full and open competition;
- appropriately applied the authority cited;
- obtained approval from the proper personnel before contract award;
- documented compliance with FAR Part 10, "Market Research;" and
- complied with synopsis requirements in FAR Subpart 5.2, "Synopsis of Proposed Contract Actions," in the contract file to support the sole-source determinations.

¹⁷ Two contracts were awarded by the U.S. Army Contracting Agency Element, Pacific–Fort Wainwright, Alaska in July 2009. The U.S. Army Contracting Agency Element, Pacific was consolidated into the Fort Wainwright Mission Installation Contracting Command in 2010.

Fort Wainwright Contracting Personnel Followed FAR Guidance for Sole-Source Awards

Fort Wainwright Mission Installation Contracting Command personnel adequately supported the use of other than full and open competition...

Fort Wainwright Mission Installation Contracting Command personnel adequately supported the use of other than full and open competition on the J&As for three contracts. Fort Wainwright contracting personnel generally documented the required elements of FAR 6.303-2 in the J&As. The contracting personnel obtained approval from the proper officials for the J&As before contract award.

FAR 6.302, "Circumstances Permitting Other Than Full and Open Competition," lists the seven exceptions that permit contracting without full and open competition. FAR 6.303-1(a) states that a contracting officer must not begin negotiations for or award a sole-source contract

without providing full and open competition unless the contracting officer justifies the use of such action in writing, certifies the accuracy and completeness of the justification, and obtains approval of the justification. Fort Wainwright contracting personnel appropriately documented the market research conducted or cited a valid exception for why they did not perform market research on the contracts. Fort Wainwright contracting personnel used a valid exception for why they did not synopsise as required.

Fort Wainwright Contracting Personnel Generally Complied With J&A Content Requirements

Fort Wainwright contracting personnel generally documented compliance with content requirements in the three J&As. Fort Wainwright contracting personnel included all the required elements as outlined in FAR 6.303-2 in one of the three J&As. The FAR identifies the minimum information that must be included in a J&A. In addition, it requires information such as a description of the supplies or services required to meet the agency's needs, the estimated value, and the statutory (legal) authority that permits other than full and open competition.

Missing Content in the J&A for Contract W912D0-11-D-0003

Fort Wainwright contracting personnel included all the required content in the J&A for contract W912D0-11-D-0003 but did not cite the specific exception to publicize the proposed contract action or whether a notice was, or will be, publicized. FAR 6.303-2(b)(6) requires the J&A to include which exception under FAR 5.202, "Exceptions," applies when a contract notice is not publicized. The contracting personnel did not cite an exception from FAR 5.202 in the J&A. However, in the acquisition strategy, they listed a valid exception for not publicizing the notice. The support was present in the contract file for the exception to posting a synopsis even though the specific FAR 5.202 exception was not stated in the J&A; therefore, we will not make a recommendation.

Missing Content in the J&A for Contract W912CZ-09-D-0017

Fort Wainwright contracting personnel included all the required content in the J&A for contract W912CZ-09-D-0017 but did not include the contracting officer's certifications that the anticipated cost to the Government would be fair and reasonable and that the justification was accurate and complete to the best of their knowledge and belief. FAR 6.303-2(b)(7) requires the J&A to include a determination by the contracting officer that the anticipated cost to the Government will be fair and reasonable. FAR 6.303-2(b)(12) requires the J&A to include a determination by the contracting officer that the justification is accurate and complete to the best of the contracting officer's knowledge and belief.

Because the contractor was uniquely qualified and was identified by the State of Alaska under the Sikes Act to perform this requirement this instance resulted from documentation omissions and did not result in an inadequate sole-source determination; therefore, we will not make a recommendation.

Fort Wainwright Contracting Personnel Generally Appropriately Applied the Sole-Source Authority Cited

Fort Wainwright contracting personnel generally appropriately applied the sole-source authority cited in the three J&As. Fort Wainwright contracting personnel awarded:

- contracts W912CZ-09-D-0017 and W912CZ-09-D-0016 citing the authority of FAR 6.302-5;¹⁸ and
- contract W912D0-11-D-0003 citing the authority of FAR 6.302-1.¹⁹

Fort Wainwright Contracting Personnel Appropriately Applied FAR 6.302-5

In the J&As for contracts W912CZ-09-D-0017 and W912CZ-09-D-0016, Fort Wainwright contracting personnel explained that the Sikes Act requires an installation to give priority to Federal and State agencies having responsibility for conservation and management of fish or wildlife. FAR 6.302-5 permits contracting without providing for full and open competition when a statute expressly authorizes or requires that the acquisition be made through another agency or from a specified source.

As required by the Sikes Act, the U.S. Army Garrison Alaska manages Army property in Alaska and is responsible for conservation planning and management for 1.6 million acres of public domain land withdrawn for military purposes. The Soil and Water Conservation Districts are the state agencies responsible for conservation planning and implementing conservation practices in Alaska in their respective district's area which includes a portion of military lands in Alaska. The Department of the Army and U.S. Army Garrison Alaska had a standing Memorandum of Agreement with the State of Alaska, Soil and Water Conservation Districts to fulfill federally mandated regulation of public domain land withdrawn for military purposes which includes things such as improving water quality and maintaining perennial vegetation to support mission requirements and enhance stewardship. Fort Wainwright contracting personnel further explained in the J&A that no in-house personnel have the required expertise and the Soil and Water

¹⁸ FAR 6.302-5, "Authorized or Required by Statute."

¹⁹ FAR 6.302-1, "Only One Responsible Source and No Other Supplies or Services Will Satisfy Agency Requirements."

Conservation Districts have been identified to provide the performance for this procurement. Therefore, Fort Wainwright contracting personnel adequately justified the sole-source awards of the contracts in accordance with FAR 6.302-5.

Fort Wainwright Contracting Personnel Should Have Cited FAR 6.302-5

In the J&A for contract W912D0-11-D-0003, Fort Wainwright contracting personnel should have cited FAR 6.302-5 as the sole-source authority instead of FAR 6.302-1. Fort Wainwright contracting personnel should have cited FAR 6.302-5 as the more appropriate authority. FAR 6.302-1 permits contracting without providing for full and open competition when supplies or services are available from only one or a limited number of responsible sources, and no other type of supplies or services will satisfy agency requirements. Contracting officials explained in the J&A that the Sikes Act directs military services to give priority for contracting INRMP services to federal and state agencies having natural resource management and regulatory authority. The J&A also stated that the Alaska Department of Fish and Game is the primary agency with responsibility for management of fish and wildlife resources on Fort Wainwright lands in Alaska and they are uniquely qualified to provide fish and wildlife services. The J&A concluded the Alaska Department of Fish and Game is the most qualified source to provide the needed services due to its years of experience with the unique wildlife issues in Alaska.

By citing the Sikes Act as the basis for the sole-source award, Fort Wainwright officials relied on the statute and its direction that priority for contracting be given to a state agency such as the Alaska Department of Fish and Game as a basis for the award. The J&A, however, never explained why no services other than those provided by the Alaska Department of Fish and Game would satisfy Fort Wainwright's requirements. Therefore, Fort Wainwright contracting personnel should have used FAR 6.302-5 instead of 6.302-1 as the authority cited. This instance did not result in an inappropriate sole-source determination; therefore, we will not make a recommendation.

Fort Wainwright Contracting Personnel Obtained Approval From the Proper Officials Before They Awarded the Contracts

Fort Wainwright contracting personnel obtained approval from the appropriate officials on the J&As before contract award as required by FAR Subpart 6.3, "Other Than Full and Open Competition." FAR 6.304, "Approval of the Justification," defines the proper approval authority at various thresholds for the estimated dollar value of the contract including options. The procuring contracting officer is

authorized by the FAR to provide the final approval for proposed contract actions up to \$650,000 and for the competition advocate of the procuring activity to provide final approval for proposed contract actions of more than \$650,000 but not exceeding \$12.5 million.

The contracting officer appropriately approved the J&A for contract W912D0-11-D-0003 because the estimated value of the contract action listed in the J&A was \$300,000. The competition advocate appropriately approved the J&A for contract W912CZ-09-D-0017 because the estimated value of the contract action listed in the J&A was \$7.5 million. The head of the procuring activity appropriately approved the J&A for contract W912CZ-09-D-0016 valued at \$25 million. The appropriate official signed the J&As before contract award as required by FAR 6.303, "Justifications."

Fort Wainwright Contracting Personnel Documented Compliance With FAR Part 10

Fort Wainwright contracting personnel appropriately documented the market research conducted for one contract and cited a valid exception for not performing market research on the other two contracts. Fort Wainwright contracting personnel included documentation to show compliance with FAR part 10 in the contract files to support the sole-source determinations. FAR part 10 states that agencies should document the results of market research in a manner appropriate to the size and complexity of the acquisition. FAR 10.002, "Procedures," states the extent of market research will vary, depending on such factors as urgency, estimated dollar value, complexity, and past experience.

Fort Wainwright contracting personnel documented the market research conducted for contract W912D0-11-D-0003 in the J&A, market research report, and acquisition strategy. For example, they explained that market research was conducted by searching the interagency contract directory, Central Contractor Registration, and Fish and Game Departments in the local area. For the two contracts citing a valid exception, the contracting officer documented that the contracting officer researched laws and regulations and determined that the contracts were expressly authorized by statute to be awarded to another government agency.

Fort Wainwright Contracting Personnel Complied With FAR Subpart 5.2

Fort Wainwright contracting personnel used a valid exception for why they did not publish solicitations as required by FAR subpart 5.2. The FAR requires agencies to make notices of proposed contract actions available from the Federal Business Opportunities website at www.fbo.gov unless one of the exceptions listed at FAR 5.202 applies. The contracting personnel used the FAR exception to

posting a notice when a contract action is expressly authorized or required by a statute. Fort Wainwright contracting personnel cited a valid exception because the Sikes Act requires military installations to work in close cooperation with the State agency that manages fish and wildlife to develop and implement INRMPs.

Summary

Fort Wainwright Mission Installation Contracting Command personnel properly awarded three contracts for INRMP support, with a value (including options) of \$32.8 million, by justifying the use of other than full and open competition. Fort Wainwright contracting personnel generally complied with FAR subpart 6.303-2 requirements in the J&As; appropriately applied the authority cited; obtained approval from the proper personnel before contract award; documented compliance with FAR part 10; and complied with synopsis requirements in FAR subpart 5.2 in the contract files to support the sole-source determinations.

Appendix A

Scope and Methodology

We conducted this performance audit from February 2015 through August 2015 in accordance with generally accepted government auditing standards. Those standards require that we plan and perform the audit to obtain sufficient, appropriate evidence to provide a reasonable basis for our findings and conclusions based on our audit objectives. We believe that the evidence obtained provides a reasonable basis for our findings and conclusions based on our audit objectives.

Review of Documentation and Interviews

We obtained and reviewed five cooperative agreements that USACE–Alaska District awarded for the development and implementation of INRMPs on DoD installations in Alaska:

- CSU, effective July 13, 2010;
- Alaska Pacific University, effective June 14, 2012;
- University of Alaska–Anchorage, effective April 17, 2014;
- Palmer Soil and Water Conservation District, effective July 9, 2014; and
- Salcha Delta Soil and Water Conservation District, effective July 9, 2014.

For the CSU cooperative agreement, we reviewed pre-award documentation including: the justification and approval for other than full and open competition, the synopsis posting from www.fbo.gov, and the legal review. For the Soil and Water Conservation Districts' cooperative agreements, we reviewed pre-award email correspondence between Fort Wainwright, Directorate of Public Works and USACE–Alaska District. USACE–Alaska District did not provide pre-award documentation for Alaska Pacific University and University of Alaska-Anchorage.

We reviewed the current INRMPs for JBER, Fort Wainwright, and Eielson AFB. We reviewed contract W912D0-11-D-0003, with a value (including options) of \$300,000, awarded by the Fort Wainwright Mission Installation Contracting Command. For the contract, we reviewed the:

- justification and approval for of other than full and open competition;
- scope of work;
- market research report; and
- acquisition strategy.

We reviewed contract W912CZ-09-D-0017, with a value (including options) of \$25 million, and contract W912CZ-09-D-0016 with a value (including options) of \$7.5 million, awarded by the U.S. Army Contracting Agency Element, Pacific–Fort Wainwright, Alaska.²⁰ For each of the contracts, we reviewed the justification and approval for other than full and open competition.

We interviewed personnel from the DoD General Counsel (Environment and Installations) to discuss the meaning and intent of the Office of the Under Secretary of Defense memorandums dated January 28, 2014, and June 20, 2014, titled “Sikes Act Implementing Procedures–Clarifying the Role of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) and State Agencies.”

At JBER, we interviewed USACE–Alaska District personnel from Contracting, Directorate of Public Works, and Office of General Counsel; personnel from U.S. Army Alaska; and personnel from the U.S. Air Force 673rd Air Base Wing, Civil Engineer Group to determine their involvement in the development and implementation of INRMPs.

At Fort Wainwright, we interviewed personnel from the Directorate of Public Works and Resource Management to determine their involvement in the development and implementation of Fort Wainwright’s INRMP. We met with the Chief, Natural/Cultural Resources at Eielson AFB to determine his involvement in the development and implementation of the INRMP at Eielson AFB.

We met with officials from other agencies involved with development and implementation of the INRMPs in Alaska including:

- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Anchorage, Alaska;
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Fairbanks, Alaska;
- U.S. Bureau of Land Management, Anchorage, Alaska;
- U.S. Bureau of Land Management, Fort Wainwright, Alaska;
- National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, Anchorage, Alaska;
- Alaska Department of Natural Resources, Anchorage, Alaska; and
- Alaska Department of Fish and Game, Anchorage, Alaska.

We met through teleconference with personnel from Alaska Pacific University and University of Alaska–Anchorage to determine their involvement in the development and implementation of INRMPs.

²⁰ The U.S. Army Contracting Agency Element, Pacific–Fort Wainwright was consolidated into the Fort Wainwright Mission Installation Contracting Command in 2010.

We reviewed:

- Title 16, United States Code, sections 670 a and b, “The Sikes Act;”
- CFR Title 32 National Defense Part 22, “DoD Grants and Agreements Regulations;”
- DoD Instruction 4715.03, Natural Resources Conservation Program (February 14, 2011); and
- AR 200—3, “Natural Resources-Land, Forest, and Wildlife Management,” obsolete as of August 28, 2007.

We also reviewed applicable sections of the FAR and the Defense Federal Acquisition Regulations Supplement.

We evaluated contract documentation obtained against applicable criteria including:

- FAR Subpart 5.2, “Synopsis of Proposed Contract Actions;”
- FAR Subpart 6.3, “Other Than Full and Open Competition;” and
- FAR Part 10, “Market Research.”

Use of Computer-Processed Data

We did not use computer-processed data to perform this audit.

Prior Coverage

No prior coverage has been conducted on cooperative agreements used for INRMP support during the last 5 years.

Appendix B

Projects Awarded for the Development and Implementation of the INRMP at Joint Base Elmendorf–Richardson, Alaska

Appendix B shows the cooperative agreement task orders awarded by USACE from April 1, 2011, through March 23, 2015, as reported by the USACE grants officer, for the development and implementation of the INRMP at Joint Base Elmendorf–Richardson, Alaska.

	Task Order Number	Recipient	Project Name	Award Date	Task Order Amount
1	35	CSU	Low impact development, non-point source assessment of snow storage area	9/30/2011	\$60,912
2	36	CSU	Salmon habitat	9/30/2011	275,179
3	44	CSU	Compliance natural resource support	4/1/2011	206,252
4	56	CSU	Integrated natural resource management plan	8/17/2011	253,000
5	67	CSU	Conservation support	4/19/2012	746,833
6	70	CSU	National environmental policy act Support	5/29/2012	105,362
7	82	CSU	Compliance natural resource support	7/30/2012	490,610
8	86	CSU	Field technical compliance natural resource support	7/27/2012	85,688
9	93	CSU	Survey and assessment	8/21/2012	78,790
10	102	CSU	Compliance natural resource support	9/26/2012	254,600
11	105	CSU	Cultural and natural resource support, fisheries	6/19/2013	283,500
		CSU	Cultural and natural resource support, wildlife		
12	106	CSU	Cultural and natural resource support, forest	6/18/2013	283,500
		CSU	Cultural and natural resource support, land management		
13	107	CSU	Cultural and natural resource support, threatened and endangered species	6/18/2013	141,750
14	108	CSU	Cultural and natural resource support: recreation, outreach, and volunteer management	6/18/2013	141,750
15	146	CSU	Interagency and intraagency Government, CSU Environmental impact analysis process	4/15/2014	118,125

Acronyms used throughout Appendix B are defined on the final page of Appendix B.

Projects Awarded for the Development and Implementation of the INRMP at Joint Base Elmendorf–Richardson, Alaska (cont'd)

	Task Order Number	Recipient	Project Name	Award Date	Task Order Amount
16	147	CSU	Interagency and intraagency Government, air quality	4/24/2014	118,125
17	164	CSU	Contractor support fisheries	5/14/2014	283,500
		CSU	Contractor support wildlife		
18	165	CSU	Contractor support forestry	5/14/2014	264,600
		CSU	Contractor support land management		
19	166	CSU	Contractor support with threatened and endangered	5/7/2014	141,750
20	175	CSU	Stream, lake and habitat survey	9/16/2014	189,000
		CSU	Macro invertebrate survey and monitoring		
21	176	CSU	Management species, beluga whale prey	9/22/2014	40,500
22	181	CSU	Resumption of year-round firing opportunities, environmental impact statement	9/25/2014	144,436
23	0001	APU	Ecological trend monitoring	7/18/2012	286,276
24	0002	APU	Management, species, and bird and wildlife aircraft strike hazard program	6/10/2013	73,000
		APU	Management, habitat, vegetative plot		
25	0003	APU	Management, species, microtines	4/30/2014	20,700
				Total	\$5,087,738

LEGEND

- APU** Alaska Pacific University
CSU Colorado State University
INRMP Integrated Natural Resources Management Plan
USACE U.S. Army Corps of Engineers

Appendix C

Projects Awarded for the Development and Implementation of INRMP at Fort Wainwright, Alaska

Appendix C shows the cooperative agreement task orders awarded by USACE from April 11, 2011, through March 23, 2015, as reported by the grants officer, for the development and implementation of the INRMP at Fort Wainwright, Alaska.

	Task Order Number	Recipient	Project Name	Award Date	Task Order Amount
1	38	CSU	DTA archaeological study	4/11/2011	\$160,000
2	39	CSU	DTA forest habitat study	5/9/2011	136,000
3	40	CSU	Aviation stationing mitigation	5/10/2011	70,000
4	41	CSU	Phase I archaeological evaluations for military construction	5/10/2011	120,000
5	46	CSU	DTA wetlands survey	7/20/2011	153,000
6	47	CSU	Training area support for RTLA survey of the sustainable range program at DTA	8/5/2011	529,418
7	48	CSU	Richardson training area RTLA and geographic information system. Surveys of the sustainable range program	8/5/2011	458,040
8	49	CSU	DTA archeological survey and report for the cold regions test center	7/19/2011	68,221
9	50	CSU	DTA vegetation survey	8/5/2011	162,800
10	51	CSU	DTA aviation survey	8/8/2011	103,000
11	52	CSU	DTA faunal survey	8/8/2011	160,000
12	55	CSU	DTA historic properties survey	8/18/2011	164,800
13	63	CSU	Forest fuel reduction study at Yukon training area	9/30/2011	35,000
14	71	CSU	Hanger Environmental Impact Statement - NEPA study support	5/29/2012	155,950
15	72	CSU	Hanger 2 and 3 Environmental Impact Statement historic properties study	5/29/2012	306,200
16	73	CSU	Hanger 2 and 3 Environmental Impact Statement - Clean water Act study	5/29/2012	391,050

Acronyms used throughout Appendix C are defined on the final page of Appendix C.

Projects Awarded for the Development and Implementation of INRMP at Fort Wainwright, Alaska (cont'd)

	Task Order Number	Recipient	Project Name	Award Date	Task Order Amount
17	74	CSU	Hanger 2 and 3 Environmental Impact Statement resource study	5/29/2012	390,300
18	75	CSU	Cultural resource	5/29/2012	55,000
19	76	CSU	Mitigation monitoring study	5/29/2012	92,100
20	77	CSU	Cultural Resource study for construction	5/29/2012	163,000
21	78	CSU	Wetland study	5/29/2012	170,000
22	83	CSU	Richardson training area, RTLA and geographic information system surveys	7/30/2012	413,700
23	84	CSU	RTLA surveys	7/30/2012	396,150
24	85	CSU	DTA RTLA surveys	7/30/2012	286,500
25	90	CSU	Ecosystem monitoring study	8/2/2012	71,016
26	94	CSU	Vegetation planning level study	9/23/2012	205,480
27	99	CSU	Wetland, archaeological and raptor study	9/23/2012	140,000
28	103	CSU	Native liaison study support	6/18/2013	94,680
29	104	CSU	Archaeological site monitoring	5/20/2013	135,495
30	109	CSU	Archaeological surveys for forest management	6/18/2013	64,994
31	110	CSU	Historic preservation study support	6/18/2013	79,950
32	111	CSU	INRMP NEPA documentation study	6/18/2013	65,800
33	112	CSU	Section 106 surveys and consultation	7/1/2013	89,530
34	113	CSU	INRMP NEPA documentation study	6/18/2013	65,800
35	115	CSU	Migratory Bird Treaty Act habitat mapping & enhancement study	7/1/2013	84,600
36	117	CSU	Richardson training area, RTLA and geographic information system study	7/1/2013	503,990
37	119	CSU	DTA RTLA Surveys	7/1/2013	233,806

Acronyms used throughout Appendix C are defined on the final page of Appendix C.

Projects Awarded for the Development and Implementation of INRMP at Fort Wainwright, Alaska (cont'd)

	Task Order Number	Recipient	Project Name	Award Date	Task Order Amount
38	120	CSU	RTLA Surveys	7/1/2013	233,806
39	125	CSU	Wetland delineation study for terrain following/terrain avoidance roads	9/20/2013	208,000
40	126	CSU	Wetland study for DTA west, Joint Pacific Alaska range complex roads	9/20/2013	216,000
41	140	CSU	NEPA tech support	9/26/2013	110,000
42	141	CSU	Terrain following/terrain avoidance bat surveys	9/26/2013	280,964
43	150	CSU	Natural resources	4/4/2014	86,385
44	153	CSU	Archaeological study for forest management	5/29/2014	62,792
45	154	CSU	Ecosystem monitoring study	5/29/2014	74,000
46	155	CSU	Fauna planning level survey study	5/29/2014	56,883
47	156	CSU	Historic preservation study support	5/29/2014	81,392
48	157	CSU	Surveying buildings and structures	5/29/2014	46,784
49	158	CSU	Historic building survey and consultation for non-military construction and maintenance	5/29/2014	76,926
50	159	CSU	Battle area complex surface danger zone monitoring	5/29/2014	125,586
51	160	CSU	Vegetation planning level study	5/29/2014	205,480
52	161	CSU	Wetland planning level studies	5/29/2014	245,440
53	162	CSU	Invasive species vegetation planning level survey	5/30/2014	41,953
54	163	CSU	NEPA study report	5/29/2014	71,714
55	168	CSU	Migratory bird nesting habitat study	6/2/2014	167,143
56	170	CSU	DTA historic context	8/29/2014	45,690
57	171	CSU	Archaeological surveys for Army training areas	8/29/2014	71,106
58	172	CSU	DTA RTLA study	8/29/2014	289,430

Acronyms used throughout Appendix C are defined on the final page of Appendix C.

Projects Awarded for the Development and Implementation of INRMP at Fort Wainwright, Alaska (cont'd)

	Task Order Number	Recipient	Project Name	Award Date	Task Order Amount
59	173	CSU	RTLA study	9/10/2014	248,548
60	174	CSU	Richardson training area, RTLA and geographic information system study	8/29/2014	409,432
61	180	CSU	Geographic information system support	9/25/2014	181,991
62	0003	Salcha	DTA bivouac pads	9/14/2014	498,256
63	0004	Salcha	DTA trail upgrade, training area repair plan	9/16/2014	990,228
64	0005	Salcha	DTA recovery plan	9/15/2014	282,852
65	0006	Salcha	DTA circular bivouac	9/16/2014	137,139
66	0007	Salcha	Granite trail project	9/24/2014	434,417
				Total	\$12,955,708

LEGEND

- CSU** Colorado State University
- DTA** Donnelly Training Area
- INRMP** Integrated Natural Resources Management Plan
- NEPA** National Environmental Policy Act
- RTLA** Range and Training Land Assessment
- Salcha** Salcha Delta Soil and Water Conservation District
- USACE** U.S. Army Corps of Engineers

Acronyms and Abbreviations

AFB	Air Force Base
AR	Army Regulation
CFR	Code of Federal Regulations
CSU	Colorado State University
DoDGARs	DoD Grants and Agreements Regulations
FAR	Federal Acquisition Regulation
INRMP	Integrated Natural Resources Management Plan
J&A	Justification and Approval
JBER	Joint Base Elmendorf–Richardson
MIPR	Military Interdepartmental Purchase Requests
NOAA	National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration
USACE	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers



Whistleblower Protection

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

The Whistleblower Protection Enhancement Act of 2012 requires the Inspector General to designate a Whistleblower Protection Ombudsman to educate agency employees about prohibitions on retaliation, and rights and remedies against retaliation for protected disclosures. The designated ombudsman is the DoD Hotline Director. For more information on your rights and remedies against retaliation, visit www.dodig.mil/programs/whistleblower.

For more information about DoD IG reports or activities, please contact us:

Congressional Liaison

congressional@dodig.mil; 703.604.8324

Media Contact

public.affairs@dodig.mil; 703.604.8324

Monthly Update

dodigconnect-request@listserve.com

Reports Mailing List

dodig_report@listserve.com

Twitter

twitter.com/DoD_IG

DoD Hotline

dodig.mil/hotline



DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE | INSPECTOR GENERAL

4800 Mark Center Drive
Alexandria, VA 22350-1500
www.dodig.mil
Defense Hotline 1.800.424.9098

